



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

wards the great fund of knowledge which is being slowly accumulated on this subject, still it is our duty to make this offering ; nor can we doubt that in the effort to accomplish it, we shall have our reward in those habits of more accurate observation and of profounder thought, to which our labours, as experimental psychologists, can scarcely fail to prove the precursors.

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF THE BRAIN.

To the Editor of the Anthropological Review.

SIR,—In your last number, in a notice of my pamphlet on the “Science of Man,” you say, “Mr. Bray seems in a dreadful hurry that every one should believe as he does ; he seems to be one of the few remaining mongrel philosophers who believe in Spurzheim as their god, and George Combe as his prophet. . . . We are sorry for Mr. Bray ; if he could only get phrenological jumble out of his blood he might yet write wisely. Mr. Bray asserts, ‘the bridge between physics and metaphysics has been found.’ By whom ? this we are not told.” Now, Sir, will you allow me a short space to show why I cannot get “phrenological jumble out of my blood,” and why “I am in a dreadful hurry that every one should believe as I do” ? In my book, “Force and its Mental Correlates,” I have shown that mind is a correlate of the physical force, and that thus metaphysics is necessarily based on physics ; but I claim no merit as a discoverer, and Herbert Spencer and others have been before me in the same field. Herbert Spencer says, “that no idea or feeling arises, save as the result of some physical force expended in producing it, is fast becoming a common place of science.” But to this subject I shall be glad to return, if you will allow me, on a future occasion ; at present I will confine myself to the other questions.

I think these may best be answered, if your readers will excuse the apparent egotism, by a short account of my “conversion” to phrenology, and my “experiences” since. Surely the life-experience of a really earnest man, who is not a “professional” anything, must be of some interest, and perhaps of some value to those who care for the truth only. I started with as strong a prejudice against phrenology as any of your present readers can possibly have. I was well up in the old and modern metaphysicians, and in my young conceit I regarded the new pseudo-science as unworthy of notice ; in fact, beneath contempt. In the spring of 1835, exactly thirty-four years ago, I was staying in

the Isle of Wight, and engaged in writing some lectures on education for our Mechanics' Institution ; I had occasion to send to town for Combe's *Physiology*, and by some mistake, which I could not account for, the publisher sent me Combe's *Phrenology*. Having nothing else to do I began to read it ; I soon got interested, and before I had read far my prejudice was gone, and I wished phrenology might be true, as its list of faculties and its mental system were so much more complete and perfect and practical for educational purposes than those with which I was then engaged. I threw my educational lectures into the fire, for I saw I had to begin again, and my "Education of the Feelings," now in its third edition, was the result. In this work I give the use and abuse of each faculty, and endeavour to show how each may be best trained and cultivated. But I became very anxious to know what truth there was in the organology of phrenology, and I accordingly hastened off to town, had my head shaved, and got Mr. Deville, of the Strand, to take a cast, to be examined by myself at my leisure, to see how far what phrenologists might have said of it corresponded with what I knew of my own character. Of course, as I discovered afterwards, it was not necessary to have my head shaved, and I merely mention it to show that I was in earnest. I have no doubt you, Mr. Editor, or some of your readers, would think it a very desirable, if not a necessary thing, to do on my own account, and you would probably look with some interest at the cast to find the crack. I also purchased of Deville one hundred casts of heads, which contained illustrations of all the organs, both fully developed and small. I must confess that at first I had some difficulty in being able in all cases to see this difference, but I never missed an opportunity of examining every head that I could get at where I knew anything of the character. After three years I had verified much of what phrenologists considered established. But my principal difficulty was with the forehead, "the straightened forehead of the fool." I had found most of the organs both large and small, and functions in accordance, but I repeatedly found, particularly in ladies, what appeared to be very large foreheads, without a corresponding amount of intellect ; in fact, with very foolish people. Hitherto I had no personal instructor, I had followed Gall's method ; wherever I heard of any peculiar talent, any mental or moral characteristic, I examined the head—but, fortunately for me, about that time (1838), George Combe, who was lecturing at Birmingham, came to stay with me, and I mentioned my difficulties about the forehead to him. He wished me to get some skulls ; I selected a large handkerchief-full from a heap, I will not say where, but none of their original owners have since applied for them. We sawed them in two, and he showed me that the part of the brain connected with the intellect was that which

lies upon the supraorbital plate, of which the forehead, particularly in women, as seen in front, was a very imperfect and often delusive indication, as the hair in some people went back almost to the middle of the head, the bald part showing a forehead ; and where the intellect was very shallow the forehead was often very high, as it then included the feelings in the moral region above it. He taught me how to measure the size of the supraorbital plate, and of the anterior lobe which lies upon it ; and thus, aided by George Combe's experience, my difficulties in that and in some other directions vanished.

You speak, Sir, in one of your annual addresses, as President of the Anthropological Society, of Mr. George Combe as an enthusiast : he was, I think, the most cautious Scotchman I ever knew ; his cry was always for facts, facts, facts, and he would listen to no theories, however plausible, without. He was one of the very last men to make "assumptions," or to accept "erroneous inferences." He perhaps paid too much deference to public opinion, keeping some things back lest the public should not accept others ; but I am quite unable to appreciate, or even to understand, the difference you seem to wish to make between Gall, and Spurzheim and Combe. I have all their works, and have read them carefully more than once, and certainly Combe's last and fifth edition of his *System of Phrenology* contains all the discoveries of the other two, and much more. As to diversity of opinion on the question, as to whether the brain is the organ of a separate entity called the mind, or the mind is a function or power of the brain, I think such differences ought not to separate us from all the facts that have been collected and recorded, and from the very useful inferences that have been drawn from them. Neither do I think the name by which we shall agree to call this collection of facts and inferences of much importance, whether Encephalonomy or Phrenology. I prefer the latter certainly, not only because it is easier to pronounce, shorter, and more generally known, but because it is really with the mind, and not the brain, that we have to do. Whatever we may *infer* with respect to the brain, and matter, and forces outside ourselves, and the way in which they may create and act upon our consciousness, it is that *consciousness* only of which we *know* anything. The objects of knowledge, in reality, are ideas, not things.

But to return to my own experience. I believe I was able to verify most of the separate "functions of the brain," said to be established by phrenologists. I do not mean to say that each of the thirty-six orthodox organs were simple or primitive in their functions, but that the functions ascribed to that particular part of the brain, whether simple or complex, belonged to it ; the American phrenologists have subdivided the organs into about one hundred, with how much truth

I cannot state ; neither do I mean to confine the organs to thirty-six ; Mr. H. G. Atkinson has made discoveries of organs lying within the falciform process, and I think I have discovered two or three on ground yet unappropriated, besides the discovery at once, from the shape of my own cast, that the organ called by Spurzheim Inhabitiveness, and by Combe Concentrativeness, is in reality two, and both gentlemen were right. The eye gradually educated itself, so that differences in the shape of the head, at first unnoticed or seen with difficulty, became evident at a glance ; the same as in a good judge of horse-flesh, the eye falls at once upon the different points and muscles required for the different services. The simplest division of the brain is into animal, moral, and intellectual faculties ; a less simple, but equally recognisable one, with a little experience, is into the social, the self-protecting, the self-regarding, the moral, the religious, the æsthetic feelings, and into the perceptive and the reflective faculties. These divisions the eye of the practised phrenologist recognises at once, and with a little closer attention the modifications and combinations.

Let a student begin with the simplest. Take a line from the angle of the eye and see how much the forehead hangs over the face as a measure of the anterior lobe, the general intellect ; next, let him rest his hands on the top of the ears and bring the thumbs to meet at the upper part of the forehead ; the portion of the brain above that is connected with the moral region ; and the part behind the ear and in front of it at the base of the brain, is connected with the animal feelings. A good shaped head, measured from the opening of the ear upwards, should be as high to the top as it is broad across or between the ears, and it should be square at the top ; if it slopes too rapidly on each side it shows firmness large, and conscientiousness less so, and firmness may be equally the servant of the lower as of the higher feelings. Our most respectable and highly intelligent superintendent of police I found had long been a phrenologist without knowing it. In choosing his men he said he rejected small heads, and chose over-hanging foreheads and high heads, as far removed as possible from the criminal type, with which he seemed to be perfectly familiar. Even the knowledge so far gained of character is of the highest importance. Breeding, education, and the reticence now the great and almost universal characteristic of good society, make it as difficult to judge of character under this smooth and smiling surface, as it is to realise the storm at sea under the calm blue sunshine and gentle ripples of the wave upon the shore. A well educated man, with no higher feeling than a desire to please, can reflect, or assume for the time, any character that the society he is then in requires and most values, whether of high or low feeling ; but follow that man home and you find a mere selfish animal. The highest

virtues are often the quietest and the most retiring, and the spiritual faculties are out of place and invisible in the world at large, and the garb and language of them can be put on for the time and for a purpose by the most selfish ; but the least experienced phrenologist sees at a glance the kind of man he has to deal with, which knowledge is only acquired by others on more intimate acquaintance. Alas, *that* knowledge with too many comes too late ! I distinguish at once the selfish from the unselfish ; the affectionate from the cold-hearted ; the proud, and vain, and boastful,—all whose geese are swans—from the modest and retiring ; I know at once the man who is in a constant state of opposition and turmoil, and who fancies all the world is quarrelling with *him* ; the revengeful and vindictive ; the desponding or hopeful ; the open or reserved ; the coward or the brave ; the miser and the book-worm ; the kind, the courteous, the conscientious, and the firm ; the credulous or the sceptic ; the poet and the wit ; the man who, with a great spiritual and poetical sense, and feeling out of harmony with the world around him, is as great a mystery to himself as to the people on a lower phase of feeling beneath him ; &c., &c.

Then as regards the intellect. As we have calculating boys, with a large organ of number, so other faculties may be as abnormally large, and give special talents, or they may combine and give special genius, or they may be all large, with active temperament, and give universal genius ; so, again, in deficiency ; one person in eighteen, Sir David Brewster showed, could not distinguish some colours from others, and about one in eighty was colour-blind ; not from defect in the eye, but in the brain. And it is the same with all the other mental faculties ; they may all be similarly deficient, and this constitutes idiocy ; if deficient only in some particular faculties, that is partial idiocy. A person may be as blind, or incompetent, in the reasoning powers from deficiency of brain as in the perception of colour, but what is very extraordinary is that people very rarely find out their own shortcomings in this respect, and a good memory for facts and events, and a good talking power too often hide them from the world ; and we have people with small brains, much talk, and little judgment, placed in high places, to the infinite damage of the widest interests. I maintain, after an experience of more than thirty years, that whatever may be the deficiencies of phrenology—and doubtless it is at present anything but a perfect system—it enables us to see these things at a glance, and we know at once the kind of man we have to deal with, so that a wise man may look upon the world as a sort of zoological garden, where every animal has to be fed and treated according to its nature.

Surely this is the most valuable of all knowledge, and you ought not to be surprised if I am in "a dreadful hurry that more people should believe as I do," that there were more "mongrel philosophers" with my experience; and that I am a little impatient that anthropologists should be confining their researches to dead matter and mere bodily characters, instead of living mental functions. Beauty and harmonious development of the brain are now inseparably connected in my mind; and your cautious induction, Mr. Editor, on the special faculty of language, with Dr. Bouillaud's "Observations and Experiments," appear to me *just the same* as if from careful examination of the structure of the eye, and pathological observation, and the use of the ophthalmoscope, you had just discovered that its probable function was to see with; that is, the left eye, but by no means the right. I have no objection to begin *de novo*, if we are not called upon to give up what we do know, and if our knowledge by thus beginning again can be made more definite and certain. But we must use Gall's method, which is to judge of mental function or power from what it does; we know that we see with our eyes, and we have not learned that fact from cutting up the eye, or from blind people, although anatomy and pathology may sometimes tell us why some people cannot see. We know equally well that a particular position of the eye-ball indicates what is vulgarly called the "gift of the gab," that is, it indicates good verbal memory, or facility in associating words or names with ideas. We know that this position of the eye-ball is owing to an indentation in the supraorbital plate caused by the abnormal size of a convolution of the brain. No doubt we have still much to learn about this faculty, and verbal memory may be its primitive function, but its manifestation or mode of action depends very much upon its association with other mental powers. Granting that there is the power I have indicated of judging of character, and I do not think I have been deceiving myself all these years, no doubt you are prepared *fully to admit* its great utility. It enables us to choose our servants and assistants in all departments; and I have always been, with one exception, the particulars of which it is not necessary to mention, well served, because I have been able to put the right man into the right place. I have done more—I have been able to start at least half-a-dozen young men in the direction that nature had *specially* intended them for; I took the square pegs out of the round holes, and in each case with complete success. It has enabled me also to choose my friends, for we know at once, and not by too often painful experience, upon whom we can implicitly rely, or whose friendship or principle is sure to break down under pressure.

But phrenology is not only practically useful wherever man is con-

cerned; it not only, by the very general admission even of those who deny its organology, presents the best system of mental philosophy, but it seems to me to furnish the key to all those deep metaphysical problems upon which mankind have hitherto been so hopelessly divided. It shows how part has been added to part in the brain as we rise in the scale of animal power and intelligence, with varied function in proportion to increased complexity of structure. It shows exactly how, and by the aid of what faculties, the world is created within us; and not only the physical world, but, through our likes and antipathies, the moral world also. As the fly, with its microscopic eye, and thousand lenses, is thus enabled to live in a world of its own, so the addition of a single mental faculty in man might place him in a very different world to that in which he now lives; for he knows of the world only as it acts upon him, and there may be thousands of influences that never reach his thick and limited perceptions. "There are," says Professor Tyndall, "numberless waves emitted by the sun and other luminous bodies which reach the retina, but which are incompetent to excite the sensation of light. If the lengths of the waves exceed a certain limit, or if they fall short of a certain other limit, they cannot generate vision; and it is to be particularly borne in mind that the capacity to produce *light* does not depend so much on the *strength* of the waves as on their *periods of recurrence*. I have often permitted waves to enter my own eye of a power which, if differently distributed, would have instantly and utterly ruined the optic nerve, but which failed to produce any impression whatever upon consciousness, because their periods were not those demanded by the retina." (*The Fortnightly Review*, Feb. 1869.)

But I cannot now pursue this part of the subject; perhaps you will allow me at some time to return to it. Let us rather take one or two of the practical questions that are now before the world, and view them by the light that phrenology throws upon them. Let us take the Civil Service competition examination. It may be quite right that no one should be employed who is not sufficiently well informed to pass such an examination, but to employ men *because* they pass is exceeding folly, as such an examination furnishes no test of *character* whatever. It does not even correctly measure the intellectual power; for a person may be as blind in judgment as some are in the power of seeing colours and yet pass such an examination. With the faculty of language, and of simple and relative perception, well developed, a person may be easily crammed to pass such an examination and yet be weak in body, idiotic in reflective power, and altogether deficient in the moral sense. Supposing that even an examination tested the whole intellect, instead of a few faculties, great intellect is too often at the

expense of bodily and vital power, and its possession gives no guarantee as to how it will be used. Such an examination is as likely to furnish only a clever rogue, as an honest, persevering, good man ; and yet how the world chuckles at its wisdom, and congratulates itself on its great advance in this department !

The *Pall Mall Gazette*, commenting on the result of this system, now in operation for the last fourteen years, says (April 27, 1869), with reference to the Civil Service clerks: "Some, of course, had been inordinately crammed, and have found their level ; others were shady characters, and went (as the Bishop of Cork would say) to the — ; but the greater proportion at once showed themselves to be intelligent, educated young gentlemen, ready for anything that might be put before them, and eager for work." No doubt, *ready for anything*,—at least, there is no reason in their examination why they should not be ; still, this little glimmer of common sense has proved to be better than the previous system based on jobbery.

Let me give one more illustration. I have shown that in proportion as the animal, moral, or intellectual region of the brain predominates, do we get a man or a mere animal. If the intellect and moral region predominate, we have a man who is ordinarily a "law unto himself," and who, if he falls into crime, does so inadvertently or under strong temptation. If the three regions are equally developed, the man will depend upon education and the circumstances, favourable or unfavourable, in which he is placed ; if the animal region decidedly predominates, we have a brutal animal ; if the animal region and intellect, often a clever rogue ; but in either case, when at large, always preying upon society. Now, in February, 1836, Sir G. S. Mackenzie petitioned Lord Glenelg, then Secretary to the Colonies, that the knowledge we have upon the subject might be used in the classification of our criminals. "At present," he said, "they are shipped off, and distributed to the settlers, without the least regard to their character or history." "There ought," he said, "to be an officer qualified to investigate the history of convicts, and to select them on phrenological principles. That such principles are the only secure grounds on which the treatment of convicts can be founded ; proof may be demanded, and it is ready for production," etc. In a separate letter, Sir George said, "men of philosophical understanding and habits of investigation have been brought to perceive that a discovery of the true mental constitution of man has been made, and that it furnishes us with an all-powerful means to improve our race. . . . Differences in talent, intelligence, and moral character, are now ascertained to be the effects of differences in organisation. . . . The differences of organisation are, as the certificates which accom-

pany this show, sufficient to indicate *externally* general dispositions, as they are proportioned among one another. Hence, we have the means of estimating, with something like precision, the actual natural characters of convicts (as of all human beings), so that we may at once determine the means best adapted for their reformation; or discover their incapacity of improvement, and their being proper subjects of continual restraint, in order to prevent their further injuring society. . . . And if, as thousands of the most talented men in Europe and America confidently anticipate, experience shall convince you, your Lordship will at once perceive a source from which prosperity and happiness will flow in abundance over all our possessions. In the hands of enlightened governors, phrenology will be an engine of unlimited improving power in perfecting human institutions, and bringing about universal good order, peace, prosperity, and happiness."

This petition was backed by a whole bookful of certificates, principally of celebrated medical men, and many of them quite equal in scientific eminence to any of the professors of the present day; among whom are Sir W. C. Ellis, M.D., Dr. C. Otto, of Copenhagen, Dr. Joseph Vimont, of Paris, Dr. Wm. Gregory, F.R.S.E., Dr. Whatcley, Archbishop of Dublin, etc., etc.; and yet this is now quite forgotten, and we have a generation brought up in ignorance of phrenology, and taught to despise it; and we have our *Anthropological Journal* declaring that "the present system of phrenologists, with all their assumptions and erroneous inferences, will soon become a theory of the past;" and we find its really talented editor groping about, *like a blind man*, after the very first organ that Gall discovered.

About the same time (April 1836), George Combe was a candidate for the chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh, and he also has printed a whole volume of testimonials from the leading men of the age, not only in this country, but in Europe and America, who certify—

"That phrenology, viewed as the abstract science of mind, is superior to any system of mental philosophy which has preceded it.

"That it contains a true exposition of the physiology of the brain.

They also certify "to its application in discriminating the varieties of insanity.

"To its bearing on the classification and treatment of criminals.

"And to its application to the purposes of education."

What an extraordinary hallucination must, then, have seized the educated and scientific world at this time, Mr. Editor, if phrenology be what you now describe it? Sir William Hamilton was chosen on that occasion, and not Mr. Combe, and I do not hesitate to say that the mental and moral philosophy of the world has been put back at least a quarter of a century in consequence.

Of course, the prayer of Sir George Mackenzie's petition could not be granted. What would all the parsons have said to the doctrine, that "differences in moral character are now ascertained to be the effects of difference in organisation"! What becomes of freedom of will and responsibility, on that view! We should have required a new system of ethics, based on the fact that mind is as much the subject of law as matter,* and that that is free, as defined by Spinoza, "whose action is determined by itself (whether that self be in its nature good or bad), and not by another." We must have laid aside our notions of retributive justice, and have been obliged to admit that no punishment is just that is not for the good of the individual offender; and that this being the case, nature's punishments are the same whether our actions are voluntary or involuntary. In fact, we should have been obliged to make precisely the same reforms in our criminal system and in our gaols as we have, during the present century, effected in our lunatic asylums, and on precisely the same principles. But society was not, and is not, prepared for this.

There are many reasons to assign for the present position of phrenology in public estimation. The first, and I have no doubt the strongest of all, is the *odium theologicum*; for there is no denying that its doctrines are opposed to the popular theology; theologians have, therefore, talked of its materialism, and have given it a bad name. It was George Combe's attempt to hide this that brought his favourite science and himself into disrepute and disfavour among the class of men who ought to have been the first to acknowledge the merits of both.

There is also much in what you say, that "Gall's theory, if true, unmasks all impostors. No man appears to a disciple of Gall other than he is; and this is utterly repulsive to some men of high scientific and social position." This is true also, because a very small brain and limited intellectual capacity are quite compatible with "high scientific and social position;" and there is also a very large class—people with large secretiveness—who instinctively hate to have the internal workings of their mind, their thoughts, and feelings, and capacities, dragged into the light. There is also, as you say, much in the odium brought upon it by some of its English disciples. Incompetent and uneducated professors make a trade of it, and profess to give characters from a shilling a head upwards; and although there is no reason why a properly qualified person should not practise phre-

* In my *Philosophy of Necessity* I have endeavoured to present a system of ethics based on this fact, and to show that we have no cause to fear for the interests of virtue and morality, which are based upon laws as fixed and determinate as the law of gravitation.

nology as a profession, quite as much as a medical man, and with more benefit to the world, yet there is no diploma, and the quacks predominate. Scientific men of position dread to be associated in any way with this sort of thing ; but what most influences them, I have no doubt, is that phrenology is what Professor Masson describes it, "a science of mind made easy." When once discovered, like many other great truths, it is very simple ; and men of science are looking for that which is abstruse and difficult, and not for that which every fool could understand. They therefore prefer metaphysics, where each man can have his own system, which neither he himself nor any one else can understand. We have, perhaps, all heard of the celebrated watch of a certain railway official, who would remark, on consulting it, "If the sun is not over the hill in a minute and a half, he'll be late." I have noticed that most scientific men are blessed with a watch of this kind, that tells the time in mental science so correctly, that all facts that do not come up to its time are beneath their notice.

I have to apologise for the length to which this paper has unpremeditatedly extended, and for its personal tone ; but I have given it this form purposely, in the hope of inducing people to follow my example, and to examine phrenology in the way I have done, for themselves, uninfluenced by public opinion, which, in this instance, would mislead them. If they will do this, I feel certain that they must come mainly to the same conclusions. I do not know a single person who, upon such careful examination, has rejected them. The objections that are ordinarily brought forward about the frontal sinus, want of parallelism in the external and internal lobes of the skull ; the hardness of the skull, as preventing expansion of the brain ; difference in temperament or quality of brain ; hereditary tendencies and transmitted mental aptitudes, etc., have no practical weight, and present little or no impediment in practice. The temperament, or the degree in which the muscular, cellular, vital, or nervous systems predominate, is the most serious difficulty ; but the experienced phrenologist knows as well what degree of activity of brain to expect, as the experienced physician is able to judge of the action of other parts of the bodily system, both in health and disease, from the complexion. If people will study the subject, it will amply repay them. Let them begin with Gall "On the Functions of the Brain, and of each of its parts ; with observations on the possibility of determining the instincts, propensities, talents, and the moral and intellectual dispositions of men and animals, by the configuration of the brain and head." Spurzheim's works will be found invaluable for their plates of the brain of man and animals, and other illustrations of development ; and George

Combe's fifth and last edition of his *System of Phrenology* contains all that is required for ordinary study of the subject. In the twenty volumes of the *Phrenological Journal* will be found a full discussion of the whole question from its first introduction into this country, with precisely the same objections, and the answers to them, as in the present day.

Coventry, May, 1869.

CHARLES BRAY.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH.—PIKE *v.* NICHOLAS.

A most important trial to British Anthropologists, and to literary men in general, has been recently decided in Vice-Chancellor James's court. The case of Pike *versus* Nicholas had been, for several months previous to the trial, known to be one which produced the greatest interest, and when, on the 27th of April, the cause commenced, a large number of Fellows of the Anthropological Society, and many celebrated literary men, were in court.

Mr. Grove, Q.C. (late President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science), and Mr. Jemmett, were for the plaintiff; Mr. Kay, Q.C., and Mr. Osborne Morgan, M.P., for the defendant.

Mr. Grove, in his opening address, gave an outline of the history of the suit. Mr. Pike, he said, had been an open scholar of Brasenose College, Oxford, and had passed through the usual stages up to the degree of M.A. He had been called to the bar in 1864; but, instead of practising, had devoted himself to literary and scientific pursuits, and especially the study of Anthropology in its various branches. He had, as early as 1858, made some jottings for the philological portion of his work, *The English and their Origin*; he had collected various materials bearing upon the subject, in many of its aspects, before the year 1864.

In the autumn of that year, there appeared an advertisement offering a prize of one hundred guineas for the best Essay upon the *Origin of the English Nation*, in English, Welsh, French, or German. The money was to be paid partly by Mr. Arthur Johnes, and partly by the National Eisteddfod. Mr. Pike, after some correspondence, in which he stated that he had already collected materials for the work, agreed to compete, on condition that, if unsuccessful, his MS. should be returned to him. Eleven essays were sent in on the 1st of March, 1865, and the decision of the judges was made known in the autumn of that year. The judges were Prince Lucien Buonaparte, Mr. Arthur Johnes, and the Rev. Basil (now Archdeacon) Jones. The last mentioned gentleman expressed high approbation of Mr. Pike's work as "a remarkable production;" hoped that it would be published, and would receive the prize, and declared that no other essay was worthy of consideration, or possessed any originality. Mr. Arthur Johnes also declared Mr. Pike's essay to be the best; and though he differed from its conclusions, thought that it